

# CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

JUNE, 1962



# CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

VOL. XXXIII, No. 6

JUNE, 1962

ROY E. SIMPSON

Superintendent of Public Instruction

EDITOR

IVAN R. WATERMAN

Chief, Bureau of Textbooks and Publications

Official Publication Issued  
Monthly by the California  
State Department of Education

Entered as second-class matter at the  
Post Office at Sacramento, California.



## CONTENTS

	Page
Matters Relating to School District Organization .....	189
Second Report of the Work of the State Curriculum Commission's Advisory Committee on Mathematics .....	205
Departmental Communications .....	211
For Your Information .....	213
Professional Literature .....	216

---

THE COVER ILLUSTRATION shows engineering instructor John A. Turaiids and student Don Bauer studying a mock-up of power demands on an industrial generator system at Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California.

## MATTERS RELATING TO SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION<sup>1</sup>

RONALD W. COX, *Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Chief,  
Division of Public School Administration*

ROBERT J. CLEMO, *Chief, Bureau of School District Organization*

The problem of school district organization, which the Department of Education has been requested by this Subcommittee on School Finance to discuss at this hearing, is an old problem. This problem has been the subject of legislative committee study and professional research as well as survey and special committee reports and activity for about 40 years. A brief review of the major actions taken and studies made during this period will provide background for the discussion.

### ACTION IN THE 1920's

In the 1920's, when California had some 4,000 separate school districts, the Legislature created and financed a study commission to review the problem. This commission, after two years of study, recommended to the Legislature that a law be adopted to provide that each county, excluding the chartered cities, become a single, unified school district. No legislative action was taken.

### ACTION IN THE 1930's

In the early 1930's, when California had some 3,500 school districts, another commission was established, using WPA funds, to study school district organization. This commission recommended that the territory in each high school district be formed into a single, unified school district. This recommendation was not adopted, but in 1935 the Legislature did adopt a law creating California's first unified school districts. The law specified that whenever the elementary district and the high school district had the same boundaries they would become unified districts, and would have but one governing board to conduct the educational program from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Of the 35 unified districts that were formed by this law, most were in urban areas.

### ACTION IN THE 1940's

In 1943, the Legislature set up the postwar California State Reconstruction and Re-employment Commission. Part of that Commission's assignment was to study school district organization. The recommendation made by that Commission resulted in the Legislature establishing

<sup>1</sup> A presentation made by Dr. Cox at a hearing of the Subcommittee on School Finance of the Assembly Interim Committee on Education, May 2, 1962, Sacramento, California.

the Commission on School Districts in 1945. The Legislature enacted the law, "Optional Reorganization of School Districts by Electors," which provided for the establishment of regional commissions on school district organization and of county committees on school district organization in each county.

California's Commission on School Districts was active until 1948, and studies were made in practically every county of the state. Some of the studies resulted in recommendations that were voted upon by the electors concerned. Many of these elections resulted in the successful formation of unified school districts as well as junior college districts and numerous union elementary school districts.

In 1948, the functions of the Commission on School Districts were transferred by the Legislature to the State Board of Education, and the work of the staff of the Commission was assigned to a newly established Bureau of School District Organization in the State Department of Education. During the period from 1948 to the present, a large number of county committees on school district organization have been active, and some progress has been made in reducing the number of school districts in the state.

#### ACTION IN THE 1950's

In 1957, a bill was introduced to require a county committee on school district organization to make recommendations involving the inclusion of all the territory in the county in one or more unified school districts. The bill provided that when the recommendation was approved by the State Board of Education, the district would be formed automatically. This mandatory measure was passed by the Assembly but was defeated in the Senate.

In 1959, the Legislature adopted a study and action measure, Assembly Bill 1538, which was mandatory with regard to master plan study and recommendation requirement, but not with regard to district reorganization. This measure, which represents the most outspoken statement yet made by the Legislature of its intent relative to school district organization, places squarely in the hands of local people the problem of bringing about improvement in their school district organization. It makes county committees responsible for developing recommendations of maximum worth, and places a civic responsibility upon every citizen to co-operate with the county committees and to become informed concerning the proposals for school district organization under study and the recommendations made.

#### PERSISTENCE OF EFFORTS TO IMPROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

It is logical and reasonable to ask why the efforts to improve school district organization have persisted over such a long period of time.

Basically, they have persisted because of two major faults in the present structure of school district organization in California: (1) too many small, inadequate, and ineffective school districts; and (2) an educational program that is bifurcated because it is commonly administered by separate districts for elementary schools and for high schools and, in most cases, by separate governing boards.

Efforts to improve school district organization have also persisted because of adherence to a principle which is broadly accepted, which is now an expression of intent by the Legislature, and which appears as a part of Education Code Section 17300. This principle may be stated as follows:

1. School districts should be so organized that they can facilitate the provision of full educational opportunities for all who attend the public schools.
2. Local control is best accomplished by developing strong, vigorous, and properly organized local school administrative units.
3. The state is responsible for creating or facilitating the creation of school districts of sufficient size to discharge the proper local responsibilities and to spend the tax dollar effectively.

Another reason why these efforts have persisted is that more people have come to know and realize that the improvement of the educational program in California is being limited or deterred because of the complicated school district organization throughout the state.

With the reorganizations already accomplished, some of the aspirations and hopes of the people in many communities have been realized. Things have happened that had never happened in the districts that existed prior to reorganization. The following improvements have been reported:

1. The newly unified districts are able to employ more teachers with baccalaureate degrees or better. There was a 12 per cent increase in the number of such teachers employed by these districts.
2. Services to pupils have been added to or improved qualitatively; and for the first time, many of the districts are able to employ specialized service personnel.
3. Curriculum improvements have been made at both the high school and elementary levels, with better co-ordination and continuity of the educational program, more supervision of instruction, and more co-operation between levels in the handling of pupil personnel problems.

Effort to improve school district organization has persisted and is now at a peak, because the sudden and large increases in pupil enrollments in the state have overburdened present revenue sources and require

more efficiency and economy in the expenditure of the educational dollar.

Today we are fully aware of the increasing financial load of operating the public school system in California. The increasing cost of constructing school buildings and the increased expenditures for school operation are of growing concern to the people. Times have changed since 1937, when the following statement was made at a meeting of the Western Government Research Association:

So far, California has had no serious difficulties in raising revenue for school purposes. And since educational expenditures have been relatively painless, there has been little inclination to consider ways and means—involving changes in organization to make public education more effectual and less expensive. California has been content to "muddle along" with a cumbersome, antiquated, and inefficient school district organization because, plainly speaking, it has been able to afford to do so.

In California the objective of school district organization programs is to effect an organization of school districts that can provide the optimum education for the dollars expended. The most effective use of tax money for public education in California cannot be made as long as our school district system remains as it is. At present there are at least the following three major areas of waste:

1. The continued operation and support of small elementary and high schools that are not sufficiently isolated to be considered necessary.
2. The duplication of educational services necessitated by the large number of overlapping school district jurisdictions.
3. The failure on the part of the existing organization to perform the business and administrative functions of school operations in the most economical manner.

#### PRESENT PROCEDURES FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The procedures established by the Legislature have, with only four minor exceptions, placed the problem of school district reorganization in the hands of the local electorate, leaving it to the electorate to initiate, study, and determine school district organization.

The four procedures mandated by the Legislature follow:

1. *Lapsation of Elementary School Districts.* Whenever an elementary school district in any year has an average daily attendance of less than five, the district is mandatorily suspended or lapsed. If suspended, it may be reinstated within two years by showing that there are eight pupils residing in the district who will attend school. If not reinstated at the end of the second year, the district is by mandate lapsed and the territory is attached to one or more contiguous districts.
2. *Placement of All Elementary School Districts in a District that Maintains a High School.* The Legislature in 1955 provided a

program whereby the county committee on school district organization was required to study each elementary school district in the county that was not part of a district maintaining a high school and, after study and public hearing, to recommend to the State Board of Education the placement of the elementary district in a high school district or a unified school district. Approval of the recommendation by the State Board of Education resulted in mandatorily effecting the recommendation. However, a petition of two-thirds of the electors of the affected district would require the State Board of Education to refer the recommendation back to the county committee. This particular provision has resulted in the continuation of 18 elementary school districts that are not in any district maintaining a high school. The recommendations of the Department of Education in 1959 to make the provisions of this legislation completely effective were not acted upon by the Legislature.

3. *Lapsation of Unified School Districts.* A unified school district which has failed to establish a high school within three years after its formation or which has fewer than ten pupils in grades nine through twelve is mandatorily lapsed and its territory attached to one or more contiguous districts.
4. *Lapsation of High School Districts.* When in any year after the first, the average daily attendance of a high school district is ten or less, the district is subject to mandatory lapsation, and its territory is attached to a contiguous high school or unified school district.

These minimum mandatory actions are quite different from the actions taken by other states. In very recent years, Nevada and West Virginia have, by legislative enactment, declared that each county would constitute a school district. For at least three decades, 14 other states, all in the south, have been operating under a county unit plan legislatively decreed; and Utah has been mandatorily organized into county units with the exception of chartered cities. However, in California, voluntary action of the electorate and general self-determination by the electors involved, through the requirement for adequate public hearings, typify the procedures established in all other district organization actions.

In California the majority of district organization actions during the past few years have been taken in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9 of Division 5 of the Education Code, entitled "Optional Re-organization of School Districts by Electors." The procedures employed in this plan may be outlined as follows:

1. County committees on school district organization in counties with six or more elementary school districts are elected by representa-

tives of the school district governing boards in the county. Where less than six elementary school districts exist, the committee is appointed by the county superintendent of schools. In counties where all the territory under the jurisdiction of the county superintendent of schools is in a single school district, the governing board of the district is the county committee on school district organization. Terms of the committee members are four years.

2. In the study for reorganization of any territory in the county, the county committee must be augmented by the governing board of each school district affected. Each affected district has a vote on the committee in any matter concerned with the study.
3. At least three study meetings must be held by the augmented county committee in the area being studied before the committee may adopt a tentative recommendation for school district reorganization. These study meetings are open to the public, and notices regarding the meeting are required to be sent to each member of the augmented committee.
4. A public hearing, duly advertised and noticed, is required prior to the final adoption by the committee of a recommendation for transmittal to the State Board of Education.
5. When the State Board of Education approves the recommendation, an election is called in the area affected, with at least one polling place in each elementary school district in the area. At least ten days prior to the election, the county committee must hold one or more public hearings, duly noticed and advertised. Also, at least ten days prior to the election, there must be distributed to each registered voter a copy of the recommendation of the county committee and arguments for and against such recommendation.
6. If at the election held on the recommendation of the county committee a majority of the votes are cast in favor of the recommendation, the proposal carries, except that if a majority of all the votes are cast by voters in one school district the proposal must carry in that district and have a majority of the combined votes cast in the other districts participating in the election.

#### MASTER PLAN OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

The Legislature in 1959 adopted Assembly Bill 1538 (Statutes of 1959, Chapter 1950), which provided that: "On or before September 15, 1963, each county committee shall prepare and submit to the State Board of Education a master plan for including all the territory of the county, including territory of adjacent counties where necessary, in school districts so that each school district shall provide an educational program including all grades from kindergarten or first grade through grade 12

together with other types of reorganization which would constitute intermediate steps to the establishment of districts operating all grades through grade 12." The procedures to be followed are the same procedures specified in Chapter 9 of Division 5 of the Education Code, which relate to the optional reorganization of school districts by electors.

This requirement that master plans covering all the territory of a county be submitted to the State Board of Education by the given date has placed a heavy workload upon county committees.

The legislation was enacted in accordance with the belief that the most desirable way for school district organization to take place is on the basis of local study and local election. It is important to the welfare of public education in the state as a whole that comprehensive studies proceed as rapidly as possible so that people in the local areas may make informed decisions.

#### PROGRESS IN SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

The progress made in reducing the number of school districts in the state is shown in Table 1 by type of district and by fiscal year.

**TABLE 1**  
**Number of School Districts by Type and Fiscal Year**

Type of district	Number of school districts for fiscal year							Change
	1935-36	1940-41	1945-46	1950-51	1955-56	1960-61	1961-62	
Elementary-----	2,735	2,512	2,248	1,779	1,533	1,316	1,266	-1,469
High school-----	295	265	260	245	233	221	212	-83
Junior college-----	17	14	14	20	22	30	39	+22
Unified-----	0	40	46	67	92	119	133	+133
Total-----	3,047	2,831	2,568	2,111	1,880	1,686	1,650	-1,397

The net reduction of 1,397 in the number of school districts does not tell the whole story, as the plus figures in the "change" column also indicate progress in district organization. The actual progress can be told only by listing the changes that indicate progress:

Change	Number of districts	Per cent of change
Reduction in elementary districts	1,469	53.7
Reduction in high school districts	83	28.1
Increase in junior college districts	22	129.0
Increase in unified districts	133	oo

After July 1, 1961, 18 additional actions on school district organization were taken, resulting in 13 successful reorganizations. These are shown in Table 2 on the following page.

TABLE 2

## School District Organization Actions Taken After July 1, 1962

Type of proposal	Formed	Not formed	Total
Unification-----	8	5	13
Unionization-----	1	0	1
Junior college district-----	2	0	2
Annexation to junior college district-----	2	9	2
Total-----	13	5	18

## PROGRESS IN MEETING MASTER PLAN

Progress in meeting the master plan requirements where studies are necessary (five counties are now unified counties) varies considerably from county to county. Some are in the early stages of development and others are well along. The degree of progress depends upon many factors, some of which are listed as follows:

1. The determination of a county committee to meet its obligation under the master plan
2. The number of school districts involved and the magnitude of the problem to be solved
3. The readiness of members of augmented county committees and of electors to discuss problems of reorganization
4. The attitude of school administrators toward the problem of unification
5. The problems that exist in the different districts
6. The ability of county committees to reach the people in a study area with information on objectives and purposes
7. The past history of organization problems in the territory

All county committees are engaged in studies of some kind within their counties. Table 3 shows the number and type of school districts in each county according to the possible maximum studies required, proposals definitely and legally under study, tentative recommendations, final recommendations, and no legal action started. The data in this table should not be interpreted as criticism for it is recognized that the county committees are working conscientiously and sincerely on very difficult assignments. The fact that more has been accomplished in some counties than in others, points up the difficulty of the problem and not the lack of interest or industry of a particular county committee.

Table 3, pages 198-99, shows that legal action has not started on 71, or about one-third of the 216 possible maximum number of proposals. However, it appears that the great majority of counties will meet the September 15, 1963 deadline. In summary, the situation may be stated as follows:

- 5 counties are presently unified
- 2 counties have completed the master plan study
- 27 counties have started legal action on the possible maximum number of proposals
- 8 counties have started legal action on all but 1 of the possible maximum number of proposals
- 6 counties have started legal action on all but 2 of the possible maximum number of proposals
- 6 counties have started legal action on all but 4 of the possible maximum number of proposals
- 2 counties have started legal action on all but 5 of the possible maximum number of proposals
- 1 county has started legal action on all but 7 of the possible maximum number of proposals
- 1 county has started legal action on all but 10 of the possible maximum number of proposals

It is not possible to state with accuracy the number of counties that will find it impossible to meet the September 15, 1963 deadline. Our best estimate is that it will be less than a dozen. The fact that some will not meet the deadline raises the question of what action should be taken at the 1963 session of the Legislature.

#### RECOMMENDATION ON EXTENSION OF MASTER PLAN LAW

It is necessary that the Legislature take some action in 1963 on the Master Plan Law to continue the momentum under which local action is now taking place. It would not be in the best interests of the public school system to slow things down. The momentum and success of the program can best be maintained by leaving the responsibility for study and recommendation under local control rather than by permitting it at this time to pass, under present law, to the Department of Education. It appears that a majority of the people would prefer an extension of the deadline rather than lose the responsibility for local action. Therefore, it is recommended that legislation be enacted that will authorize the State Board of Education to grant an extension of time beyond the September 1, 1963 deadline upon request by a county committee. The extension shall be granted by the Board for a period not longer than one year upon its finding that good and substantial reasons exist for such extension.

**TABLE 3**  
**Present Status of School District Organization Unification Studies by County**  
**(Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve)**

County	Total number of school districts	Elementary	High school	Unified	Possible maximum proposals	Proposals under study	Tentative recommendations	Final recommendations	No action started
Alameda.....	34	23	4	7	6	2	4	0	0
Alpine.....	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Amador.....	6	3	1	2	1	1	0	0	0
Butte.....	34	28	4	2	4	1	0	0	3
Calaveras.....	4	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Colusa.....	11	7	2	2	2	1	1	0	0
Contra Costa.....	32	23	6	3	6	3	2	1	0
Del Norte.....	6	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
El Dorado.....	18	16	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Fresno.....	85	68	14	3	14	4	1	1	8
Glenn.....	16	11	3	2	3	2	0	1	0
Humboldt.....	49	43	4	2	4	0	2	1	1
Imperial.....	25	18	4	3	4	0	0	0	0*
Inyo.....	11	6	2	3	2	2	0	0	0
Kern.....	56	48	4	4	4	2	0	0	2**
Kings.....	17	14	2	1	2	1	1	0	0
Lake.....	12	7	4	1	4	3	0	1	0
Lassen.....	15	12	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
Los Angeles.....	92	48	11	33	11	11	0	0	0
Madera.....	23	21	2	0	2	2	0	0	0
Marin.....	25	21	3	1	4	3	0	1	0
Marietta.....	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mendocino.....	27	18	6	3	6	1	0	0	5
Merced.....	31	25	5	3	7	3	2	0	4
Modoc.....	14	12	2	0	2	0	0	0	0

\* At present studying county-wide unification.  
\*\* County committee has made master plan studies; legal procedures on separate proposals not yet initiated.

**CURRENT PROBLEMS RELATING TO PROCEDURES AND LAWS**

Current unification problems relating to school district organization laws and procedures include (1) the inside-outside vote; (2) exclusion of a district from a proposal; and (3) financial support.

**THE INSIDE-OUTSIDE VOTE**

In an election held to form a unified school district, the district is formed if a majority of all the votes are cast in favor of the unification; except that if a majority of the votes are cast in one district, the proposal for unification must carry in that district and in addition by a majority of the combined votes in all the other districts. This is commonly called the "inside-outside vote" and has in some instances created definite problems in achieving unified school districts, especially in areas where the territory proposed for unification consists of two elementary districts within a single high school district. This situation has permitted a minority of electors to thwart the desires of the majority, and could lead to a situation in which the minority could determine the destiny of the majority with respect to school district organization.

The most recent problem of this type, involving the territory of the Garden Grove Union High School District, which includes the Garden Grove and the Alamitos elementary school districts, is outlined as follows to illustrate the problem.

1. The Orange County Committee recommended that a unified district be formed within the territory of the Garden Grove Union High School District. The recommendation was approved by the State Board of Education but was defeated at an election held on September 26, 1961 by the following vote:

Elementary school district	For unification	Against unification
Garden Grove (approved)	3,800	770
Alamitos (rejected)	1,233	2,399
Total	5,033	3,169

It must be noted that a majority of the votes were cast for unification, but under the "inside-outside" voting procedure the unified district was not formed because of its rejection by the Alamitos Elementary School District.

2. The Orange County Committee on School District Organization returned to the State Board of Education with the recommendation that two unified districts be formed—one in Alamitos and one in Garden Grove. This recommendation was protested by electors in the Garden Grove Elementary School District, who contended that:
  - a. A majority of the people in the area favored a single unified district.

- b. The electors in Alamitos would approve the formation of an Alamitos Unified School District.
- c. According to the law relating to coterminous boundaries of high school and elementary school districts, a unified district would be formed automatically in the Garden Grove area, regardless of what the electors of the area desired.
- d. The electors of the Garden Grove area would therefore be forced to vote, against their desires, for a unified district in that area in order to be eligible for foundation program increases to newly formed unified districts.

The State Board of Education did not approve the recommendation of the Orange County Committee on School District Organization.

This same type of situation may occur in a significant number of areas, as there are 25 such high school districts throughout the state.

The problem created by the "inside-outside" vote deserves consideration by the Legislature if school districts are to be organized as desired by the majority of the electors. In an election involving two elementary school districts, the present law permits not only the exercise of veto power by the minority, but also can lead to the minority determining the fate of the majority in an area where, for high school purposes, a single electorate exists.

*Recommendation on Inside-Outside Vote.* It is recommended that Education Code Section 3167 be amended to provide that in an election involving only two elementary school districts in the area of a high school district, the new district shall be formed if a majority of the votes are cast in favor of the proposal.

#### EXCLUSION OF DISTRICT FROM A PROPOSAL

Present law makes it possible in formulating a proposal for school district unification to exclude an elementary school district that is part of the high school district considered in the proposal. Exclusions such as these have been made upon requests by governing boards of elementary school districts as well as by county committees. An excluded district, in the event of the formation of a unified district, being the remaining portion of the high school district, becomes a unified district because of coterminous boundaries. When two or more elementary districts are excluded (this has happened twice), they constitute the original high school district.

When an exclusion of two or more school districts occurs in an area with less than ten pupils, these districts are lapsed and attached to the adjoining unified school district or elementary school district that is part of a high school district (Education Code Sections 2511 and 2512).

When an exclusion of one elementary district occurs, forming a unified district, Education Code Section 2898 provides for its lapsation when the average daily attendance falls below ten or if in three years the district has not established a high school.

Some of these exclusions, whether requested by the school district or by the county committee, have caused concern among electors of the districts involved. The exclusions are generally made for the purpose of assuring the success of a proposal desired by the majority. However, the excluded district is generally lapsed and then most likely attached to the district formed by successful election on the proposal.

Some persons have called the exclusion practice unfair. It was originally placed in the law for the purpose of permitting a majority of electors in an area to realize their aspirations for a unified district. It would be unfair to create a situation whereby a minority could continue to thwart the desire of a majority.

*Recommendation on Exclusion of a District from a Proposal.* It is the recommendation of the Department of Education that these provisions remain in the Education Code unchanged, unless the Legislature wishes to require at least 100 pupils instead of at least ten as a minimum number before lapsation becomes effective.

#### FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF THE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

In many school district unifications involving districts of varying wealth in assessed valuation per average daily attendance, the new district is more able than the cumulative ability of the individual districts involved. This results in the withdrawal of state equalization aid.

Unification requires the adoption of a single salary schedule for elementary school and high school teachers. This necessitates higher local taxes.

Newly unified school districts are required to continue in service certain personnel of the component districts. This postpones staff reorganization and is costly.

*Recommendation on Support of Unified School Districts.* The three financial factors which act as deterrents to unification should be removed by providing for unified school districts a foundation program that recognizes the existence of these factors as well as the fact that the district is properly organized. A precise recommendation on this problem would be more appropriate in connection with financing public schools.

#### OTHER PROBLEMS

Problems other than those of unification that merit consideration pertain to elementary school districts that are not in high school districts, and the suspension of small school districts.

**ELEMENTARY DISTRICTS NOT IN A HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

At the present time there are 16 elementary school districts with a total average daily attendance of 1,830, that are not in any high school district. The assessed valuation of this territory is \$37,379,445, all of which is exempt from taxation by high school districts and is not subject to levy for high school bonds. The pupils attend high schools in districts to which tuition is paid, but their parents do not participate in nor assume the same financial responsibility for the operation of the high school districts as do residents of the other districts.

In 1955, the Legislature declared it to be policy that all elementary school districts shall be included in high school districts. A procedure was established whereby county committees were required after February 1, 1957, to recommend that elementary districts not in any high school district be annexed to a high school or unified district. An escape clause added to this legislation provides that whenever a petition is signed by two-thirds of the electors in opposition to such annexation, and presented to the State Board of Education, the Board shall not order the annexation to be made.

Elementary school districts that are not in a high school district are not in any junior college district either. The law provides that territory formed into a junior college district shall include entire high school or unified districts.

Several ways in which this problem could be solved follow:

1. Require county committees to take the same action as was required in 1957, but eliminate the escape clause. This would solve the problem quickly.
2. Permit those districts to be annexed to high school or unified districts upon petition to the county board of supervisors by the board of trustees or the electors.
3. Increase the tuition of nonhigh school territory so that the financial burden upon taxpayers of the district would be at least equal to that of residents of the high school or unified district.

**SMALL DISTRICTS AND SUSPENSION**

During the 1960-61 school year, of the 508 districts operating schools with an average daily attendance of less than 100, there were 181 school districts with an average daily attendance of less than 26; and 49 of the 181 school districts had an average daily attendance of ten or less.

Schools in many of these very small districts are within reasonable distance of other schools, and it would be feasible to reorganize them into larger districts wherein a graded school could be established if the electors were willing.

The school districts that consist of schools with an average daily attendance of less than 26 probably present a more acute problem than

do the slightly larger schools, because educational efficiency reaches its lowest level and the unit cost is highest in relation to the program and services offered in the smallest schools. These districts are unable to compete for the best qualified teachers, because they can offer neither challenge, opportunity, nor salary comparable to that offered in larger school systems.

The law provides for the suspension and lapsation of elementary school districts when the average daily attendance of the district becomes five or less. Section 1871 of the Education Code states that, "If in any elementary school district there has been an average daily attendance of only five or less during the whole school year, the county superintendent of schools having jurisdiction shall report the fact to the board of supervisors at its first meeting in July or August with his recommendation that the district be suspended or lapsed."

The laws governing the suspension and lapsation of school districts permit schools to be kept in operation after they have declined to a point where they can no longer serve the district effectively. Possible solutions to the problems of maintaining such schools follow:

1. Provide for the lapsation or suspension of a school district when its average daily attendance drops below 25.
2. Permit the governing board or the board of supervisors of a school district, upon petition of electors, to declare the district to be lapsed or suspended.
3. Provide only the constitutionally guaranteed basic aid for school districts that have been declared unnecessary.
4. Require a district in which the schools have less than 25 average daily attendance to contract with a contiguous district for the education of its children, and provide for the lapsation of the district if the average daily attendance of pupils under contract does not exceed 25 after a period of three years.

#### RECOGNITION OF COUNTY COMMITTEES

The Department of Education has deemed it a privilege to work with the various county committees on school district organization. They have provided leadership, given of their time and effort, and have sincerely worked at the assignment of improving school district organization. Their work is so important and basic to the improvement of the public education system in California, that the Department of Education considers the county committees deserving of commendation from the Legislature in an appropriate way.

## **SECOND REPORT OF THE WORK OF THE STATE CURRICULUM COMMISSION'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON MATHEMATICS**

**GEORGE H. McMEEN, Administrative Consultant to the Advisory Committee  
on Mathematics, and Consultant in Mathematics, NDEA, Bureau of  
Secondary Education**

This report, a sequel to the first report on the work of the Advisory Committee on Mathematics,<sup>1</sup> is presented to inform interested personnel of the far-reaching effects that the plans of the Committee will have in shaping a mathematics program in the years ahead for pupils from kindergarten through grade eight.

After six two-day meetings, three of which were held during the 1960-61 school year, the others were held October 2-3 and December 11-12, 1961, and February 15-16, 1962, the Advisory Committee on Mathematics completed that portion of its work which necessitated meetings of the entire membership. Certain subcommittee assignments which remained to be completed are outlined in the following sections.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON STRANDS OF MATHEMATICAL IDEAS**

Mathematics is viewed as a fabric woven from certain basic strands or fundamental concepts, which run through the entire curriculum. The Advisory Committee's Subcommittee on Strands of Mathematical Ideas<sup>2</sup> presented its final report to the Curriculum Commission on March 8, 1962. This report, prepared for the guidance of the Commission in adopting new textbooks for the kindergarten through grade eight mathematics program, identifies the essential integrating strands of mathematical ideas that should be incorporated in the program.

The development of the report of the Subcommittee on Strands of Mathematical Ideas was an amazing example of co-operative effort by the subcommittee membership. Following an identification of the essential strands of mathematics in early meetings, members of the subcommittee wrote materials which went through several revisions after the Advisory Committee had reacted to them on different occasions. During October, 1961, a writing team composed of John L. Kelley, Stewart Moredock, and Mary McDermott, assisted by E. G. Begle and George H. McMeen, started rewriting the strands statements in a uniform manner, and subsequently the writing team rewrote the statements

<sup>1</sup> George H. McMeen, "First Report on the Work of the State Curriculum Commission's Advisory Committee on Mathematics," *California Schools*, XXXII, (October, 1961) 395-400.

<sup>2</sup> Chairman, C. Richard Purdy, Professor of Mathematics, Alameda County State College, Hayward.

several times in keeping with the comments of team members and the evaluations given by members of the Advisory Committee. Richard Madden assisted the writing team by rewriting the critical strand, "Numbers and Operations."

While the final strands report does not reflect the opinion of every single committee member on every single topic, it does represent a consensus that is remarkable for such a large group of educators with diverse mathematical backgrounds. This consensus was achieved only through the willingness of committee members to freely express their own ideas and to abide by the judgment of the majority.

The Curriculum Commission, in a joint meeting with the State Board of Education on March 9, 1962, cited the excellent work of the Advisory Committee on Mathematics as an example of what can be achieved by a group of experts when sufficient funds are available to make their work possible. Since the Advisory Committee was working in the area of mathematics, one of the educational areas recognized as critically important by the federal government, financial support was made available through the National Defense Education Act.

Although the report of the Subcommittee on Strands of Mathematical Ideas was written primarily for the guidance of the Curriculum Commission in adopting mathematics textbooks, the implications of the report are far-reaching for school personnel concerned with the emerging mathematics program, kindergarten through grade eight. Because of the great need for familiarizing elementary school teachers with the new trends prior to the time when they will face the problem of teaching from more modern mathematics textbooks, the Curriculum Commission plans to distribute the report to school personnel just as soon as possible. However, there is first a need to prepare accompanying explanatory statements and materials to make the report intelligible to the teacher who is not presently abreast of the latest ideas and terminology. In its present form, without auxiliary explanations, the report might be misinterpreted by many, and might not be given the consideration that it deserves. Plans for the amplification of the report are proceeding, and it is anticipated that the report will be distributed to the schools with accompanying amplification later this year.

Some pertinent contents of the strands report have been abstracted in the section which follows. It should be noted that no attempt has been made to explain ideas fully in this brief article.

#### ABSTRACT OF THE STRANDS REPORT

The introduction to the strands report identifies the cultural changes in recent years that necessitate a new approach to the teaching of mathematics. These changes call for a shift not only in content emphasis, and the introduction of many new topics, but also a shift in pedagogical

procedures to place greater emphasis upon the discovery method of instruction. The strands report states that "Pupils should be encouraged to make conjectures and guesses, to experiment, to formulate hypotheses, and to understand."

The basic topics in the mathematics curriculum for kindergarten through grade eight are identified as Numbers and Operations; Geometry; Measurement; and Applications. However, because of the remarkable advances that have been made in achieving clarity and precision in mathematical discourse, the report recommends that pupils be led to understand that many apparently diverse notions are based on a few underlying concepts. "Consequently," states the report, "we recommend a planned and conscious development of certain strands which contribute to this clarity, precision, and economy. These are the strands labeled Sets, Functions, Logic, and Mathematical Sentences."

The report discusses each of these strands in turn. The following outline presents some of the main ideas from each strand:

#### I. Numbers and Operations

- A. Development of number systems: natural numbers, whole numbers, integers, rational numbers, and introduction to real numbers
  1. Use of matching or one-to-one correspondence as the basis for instruction in counting
  2. Definitions of the operations and their relationships
    - a. Cartesian product concept of multiplication
    - b. Subtraction as the inverse of addition
    - c. Division as the inverse of multiplication
  3. Properties of the operations: commutativity, associativity, distributivity, closure, identity, expressed in appropriate terminology for elementary school pupils
  4. Special properties of 0 and 1
  5. Use of the terms "number" and "numeral"
  6. Use of the number line for visualization of mathematical abstractions: ordering and comparing of numbers; association of numbers with points on a line; different numerals for the same number; no smallest or largest rational number; number facts; concepts of operations
  7. Development of the multiplicative structure of natural numbers, including the study of factoring, prime numbers, and tests of divisibility
  8. Use of rate, ratio, and per cent as special interpretations of rational and real numbers

9. Introduction to study of real numbers by showing rational numbers as periodic decimals, and noting that numbers like *the square root of 2* are not rational

B. Systems of numeration and notation

1. Development of the place-value, decimal system of numeration and its use in computational algorithms
  - a. Consideration of systems of numeration with different bases to provide clearer understanding of the decimal system
  - b. Study of some historical nonpositional numeration systems for vestiges of utility and for their value, in contrast with positional systems
2. Study of integral powers of 10; meaning of exponents; scientific notation as a natural outgrowth of place-value notation

II. Geometry

1. Introduction to the simpler plane configurations considered as sets of points, including lines, line segments, rays, angles, closed figures
2. Discussion of simpler relationships among geometric configurations, including intersection, parallelism, perpendicularity, congruence, similarity
3. Construction of geometric figures through use of a variety of instruments
4. Recognition of common plane and solid figures and their distinguishing characteristics
5. Interpretations of geometric relationships that yield arithmetic properties: arrays, number lines, graphs, solutions of number sentences

III. Measurement

1. Concept of measurement as an association of a number with an object through comparison with an arbitrarily chosen unit
2. Common standard units, including the metric system
3. Conversion of measures to different units
4. Estimation
5. Computation with approximate data, including ideas of precision and accuracy
6. Drawing to scale

**IV. Functions and graphs**

1. Development of the abstract mathematical concept of function through pairing numbers with objects or other numbers in counting, lengths, areas, formulas, tabular and graphical data, operations

**V. Mathematical sentences (used in statements of equality and inequality)**

1. Use of mathematical sentences in presenting number facts
2. Use of mathematical sentences in problem solving
3. Use of mathematical sentences to aid in stating mathematical principles precisely

**VI. Logic**

1. Concept of equality as meaning logical identity
2. Informal treatment, at appropriate levels for elementary school pupils, of concepts of logical thinking: definition, implication, quantification

**VII. Sets**

1. Introduction and effective use of the set concept and related concepts to develop ideas of arithmetic and geometry
2. Introduction of and use of terminology and notation of sets only when appropriate

**VIII. Applications and problem solving**

1. Maintenance of proper balance between mathematics, per se, and its applications
2. Applications in subject matter areas accompanied by appropriate statistical notions
3. Translations of problem situations into terms and models appropriate to pupils' level
4. Variety in problem solving methods

**REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPLEMENTATION**

The Subcommittee on Implementation: Teachers and Pilot Programs<sup>8</sup> had not completed its extensive report before the preparation of this article. It would be presumptuous to do more than outline here the contents of this report, which was subsequently presented to the Curriculum Commission in May, 1962, and which included (1) a study of

<sup>8</sup> Chairman, William F. McClintock, Director of Elementary Education, Office of Stanislaus County Superintendent of Schools.

preservice mathematics education in California institutions of higher learning and recommendations for improvement; (2) a report on selected in-service projects; and (3) a report on recommendations for the extension and operation of in-service education programs.

Substantial portions of this report had already been presented to members of the Advisory Committee on Mathematics during 1961 and 1962, and had received their endorsement.

#### REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEW PROGRAMS AND SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

The report of the Subcommittee on New Programs and Supplementary Materials,<sup>4</sup> which had not been completed at the time of the preparation of this article, was also presented to the Curriculum Commission in May, 1962. This subcommittee terminated its study of new programs last fall, and subsequently devoted its attention exclusively to the study of supplementary materials for implementing the recommendations of the strands report.

On several occasions the Advisory Committee on Mathematics has reaffirmed the critical need for providing supplementary mathematics materials for elementary schools prior to 1965, so that teachers can "start getting their feet wet now." Trial usage of supplementary materials will help teachers prepare for the more modern texts which will likely be put into use at that time. However, since the new textbooks may not fully implement the strands report, the Advisory Committee on Mathematics has recommended that supplementary materials be used jointly with the new 1965 state-wide adoption.

The report which the Subcommittee on New Programs and Supplementary Materials presented to the Curriculum Commission stressed the need for supplementary materials both now and after 1965, and included an annotated list and appraisal of supplementary materials which the subcommittee had studied and recommended. It is hoped that the Curriculum Commission's adoption will be based on this list. However, since a state-wide adoption involves the consumption of much time, and financial support for such an adoption is uncertain, it is hoped that the annotated list may be released to the schools early this summer with the recommendation that they make voluntary purchases from the list for immediate use this coming fall.

<sup>4</sup> Chairman, Mrs. Leslie S. Beatty, General Supervisor of Elementary Education, Chula Vista Elementary School District.

# Departmental Communications

## OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

ROY E. SIMPSON, *Superintendent*

### APPOINTMENT TO STAFF

LLOYD G. STEELE was appointed Special Supervisor of Trade and Industrial Education, April 1, 1962. Mr. Steele attended high school in Clear Lake, South Dakota, and Long Beach City College, Long Beach, California. Since his graduation from Long Beach State College with a bachelor of arts degree in 1956, he has been teaching at Los Angeles Pierce College, Woodland Hills, California. Mr. Steele has also done graduate work at the University of California, Los Angeles, and at San Fernando State College, where he received his master of arts degree.

### BUREAU OF TEXTBOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

IVAN R. WATERMAN, *Chief*

### RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RUTH A. MARTINSON. *Special Programs for Gifted Pupils.* Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Vol. XXXI, No. 1, January, 1962. Pp. x + 110.

This bulletin is designed to provide assistance to school district personnel and school staff members in planning programs for gifted pupils. The findings and recommendations are based mainly on a three-year study of the educational needs of intellectually gifted pupils and of the procedures that teachers, supervisors, pupil personnel workers, and administrators may employ to enable these pupils to develop their potential abilities successfully. Means of identifying gifted children, and data on their characteristics and needs are presented, as well as suggestions for their guidance. Plans for specific programs, which are listed in detail, include various phases of enrichment, acceleration, and special groupings. Techniques for program evaluation and for self-evaluation by teachers are discussed. Appendixes include sample forms used in connection with the three-year study; a copy of the recently enacted Assembly Bill 362, which established a plan for financial assistance to school districts with programs for gifted pupils; and rules and regulations set forth by the State Board of Education in relation to these programs.

Copies have been distributed to county, city, and district superintendents of schools, to principals of elementary and secondary schools, and to selected personnel involved in programs for gifted pupils. The price is 30 cents per copy plus sales tax on California orders.

*Reports on Regional Conferences on Improving Science Instruction in Elementary Schools.* Sponsored by the California State Department of Education under provisions of the National Defense Education Act. Los Angeles State College, January 27-28, 1961; Modesto, April 14-15, 1961. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1962, Pp. viii + 112.

These conference reports have been made available so that school personnel may be informed of the possibilities for expanding and improving their programs of science instruction according to the most recent findings of specialists in this field. The development of scientific concepts and the in-service training of elementary school teachers for science instruction were the major topics of these two conferences.

Copies have been sent to county, city, and district superintendents of schools and to selected personnel. The price is 40 cents per copy plus sales tax on California orders.

*Reports of Regional Conferences on Improving Modern Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools.* Sponsored by the California State Department of Education under provisions of the National Defense Education Act. Pasadena, February 3-4, 1961; Palo Alto, February 17-18, 1961. Pp. viii + 116.

The conference activities reported in this publication were planned to aid curriculum workers, teachers, and administrators in becoming acquainted with expert opinion on and new techniques in the field of foreign language instruction and in-service education. The reports have been made available to school personnel who participate in the recently expanded foreign language program in California schools, to promote recognition of present accomplishments and future goals in this area of instruction.

Copies have been distributed to county, city, and district superintendents of schools and to selected personnel. The price is 50 cents per copy plus sales tax on California orders.

*A Report of a Study—Processing Pupil Personnel Data.* Prepared by ALVIN GROSSMAN with the assistance of the State Advisory Committee on Integrated Data Processing. Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Vol. XXXI, No. 2, March, 1962. Pp. viii + 120.

This is the first report of a study to help California school districts establish and maintain efficient systems of integrated data processing. The study was conducted by the Bureau of Pupil Personnel Services with the assistance of the State Advisory Committee on Integrated Data Processing, a group composed of specialists in the various fields related to the collection and use of pupil personnel data. This bulletin contains findings and recommendations of the state-wide study; information about time-saving methods of collecting data that can free professional staffs for more counseling work; and guidelines for establishing data processing centers.

Copies have been distributed to county, city, and district superintendents of schools and to selected personnel. The price is 85 cents per copy plus sales tax on California orders.

## For Your Information

### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTIONS

The following actions were taken by the State Board of Education at its regular meeting held in Wilmington, April 12 and 13, 1962.

#### *Approval of Organizations for School District Membership*

In accordance with Education Code Section 1131, the Board approved the following organizations for which membership may be paid from funds of school districts or offices of county superintendents of schools, subject, however, to the organization notifying the Department of Education immediately, whenever there is a change in the bylaws, charter, constitution, or purposes of the organization, and subject further to withdrawal of approval by the State Board of Education at its discretion subsequent to such a change.

#### *Approved for membership by schools and by county superintendents of schools*

California Association of Public School Business Officials<sup>1</sup>

*President:* Ernest W. Carl

*Secretary:* Robert Barnes

*Headquarters address:* 1100 North San Jose Hills Road, Walnut, California

Educational Film Library Association, Inc.<sup>2</sup>

*President:* Frederic A. Krahn, Public Library, East Meadow, New York

*Secretary:* Kathryn Carlin, Dade County Public Schools, Florida

*Administrative Director:* Emily S. Jones

*Headquarters address:* 250 West 57th Street, New York 19, New York

#### **Correction**

The California School Employee's Association should have been listed in the April issue of *California Schools* as approved for membership "by schools" as well as by county superintendents of schools.

#### *Approval of Proposals for School District Organization Changes*

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9 of Division 5 of the Education Code (Section 3151), the Board approved the following proposal regarding changes in school district organization:

*Formation of a unified school district in Glenn County*—A proposal by the Glenn County Committee on School District Organization that an election be held to determine whether the voters in the area of the Orland Joint Union High School District wish to form a unified school district.

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 7 of Division 5 of the Education Code (Section 2557), the Board approved the following proposals regarding changes in school district organization:

<sup>1</sup> Approved for the school years, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65.

<sup>2</sup> Approved for the school years, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64.

*A request for permission to hold an election to form a junior college district in Kern County*—A proposal by the governing board of the Taft Union High School District that an election be held to determine whether the voters in the district wish to form a separate junior college district coterminous with the present boundaries of this high school district.

*A request for permission to hold an election to form a junior college district in Shasta County*—A proposal by the governing board of the Shasta Union High School District that an election be held to determine whether the voters in the district wish to form a separate junior college district coterminous with the present boundaries of this high school district.

#### **Revocation of Credentials for Public School Service**

The Board revoked the credentials, life diplomas, and other documents for public school service heretofore issued to the following persons:

Name	Date of birth	Revocation effective	By authority of Education Code Section
Bartruff, Charles William	2-25-25	March 18, 1962	13205
Bercut, Florence	6-14-25	April 13, 1962	13206
Bladow, Elmer Lloyd	3-6-10	April 13, 1962	{13205 13207}
Cheroske, Robert Husek	6-11-24	April 3, 1962	13205
Norton, Oran Richard	4-18-37	March 29, 1962	13205
Price, Robert Gerald	7-21-27	April 13, 1962	13207
Reeder, Dean Clinton	8-23-32	April 13, 1962	13207
Richey, Edith Rose Marx	9-10-32	April 13, 1962	13206
Tully, William J. (a.k.a. William Jird Tully)	8-29-27	March 15, 1962	13205
Vasquez, Arturo	4-16-35	March 24, 1962	13205
Watson, Malcolm Campbell	1-14-12	April 13, 1962	13206

#### **Suspension of Credentials for Public School Service**

In accordance with the provisions of Education Code Section 13202, the Board suspended indefinitely the credentials, life diplomas, and other certification documents heretofore issued to Adrian Chris Gonvers (birth date 9-15-34), until he shall have established to the Board that he is completely rehabilitated.

#### **CONFERENCE ON TEACHING OF ENGLISH**

A conference on "Examining New Trends in the Teaching of English" is scheduled to be held November 2, 3 and 4, 1962, at California Polytechnic College, San Dimas, California, for elementary, secondary, and college teachers of English, and for supervisors and administrators. Demonstrations and group discussions will be a part of the conference, and two of the speakers will be Richard M. Clowes, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction and Chief of the Division of Instruction, California State Department of Education, and James R. Squire, Executive Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English.

The Orange County Council of Teachers of English, the Southern California Council of Teachers of English, and the California State De-

partment of Education are sponsoring the conference with the co-operation of the California Association of Secondary School Administrators and the California Elementary School Administrators Association.

The members of the conference committee are: Barbara Hartsig, Orange County State College; Howard Hovey, Magnolia High School, Anaheim; Roger Hyndman, Los Angeles City Schools (chairman); Fred Myers, Anaheim High School; Lorietta Scheerer, Redondo High School; Evelyn Thompson, Occidental College; and Everett O'Rourke, California State Department of Education.

Information concerning lodging, meals, and details of the conference program can be obtained from Fred Myers, Anaheim High School, 811 West Center Street, Anaheim, California.

# Professional Literature

## PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

*Administration of Public Laws 874 and 815: Eleventh Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, June 30, 1961.* OE-22003-61, Office of Education. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Pp. vi + 182. \$1.25.\*

*Careers in Fact and Fiction.* Albany, New York: Bureau of Guidance, New York State Education Department, University of the State of New York, 1961. Pp. 108.

CASTETTER, WILLIAM B. *Administering the School Personnel Program.* New York 11: The Macmillan Co., 1962. Pp. xvi + 400. \$6.90.

*Conducting School Civic Club Activities: Teachers Handbook.* Curriculum Research Report. Brooklyn 1, N.Y.: Bureau of Curriculum Research, Division of Curriculum Development, Board of Education of the City of New York, 1962. Pp. iv + 36. \$0.50.

*Curriculum Resource Materials for Meeting School Retention and Pre-Employment Needs: Youth Achievement Program.* Curriculum Bulletin No. 8, 1960-61 Series. Brooklyn 1, N.Y.: Divisions of Curriculum Development and of High Schools, Board of Education of the City of New York, 1962. Pp. viii + 228. \$1.50.

*Developing Student Participation in School Government.* Curriculum Bulletin, 1960-61 Series, No. 12. Brooklyn 1, New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1961. Pp. vi + 54. \$0.50.

*Educational Television: The Next Ten Years.* A report and summary of major studies on the problems and potential of educational television, conducted under the auspices of the United States Office of Education. Stanford, California: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1962. Pp. xii + 380.

FEATHERSTON, E. GLENN, and MURRAY, JOHN B. *State School Bus Standards.* OE-20035, Circular No. 466 (revised), Office of Education. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Pp. 12.\*

HALL, ROBERT C., and CRAIGIE, STANTON. *Student Borrowers: Their Needs and Resources.* National Defense Student Loan Program. OE-55011, Office of Education. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Pp. vi + 82. \$0.55.\*

MITCHELL, AGNESE DINEEN. *Phonics for Children.* New York 1, N.Y.: Vantage Press, Inc., 1962. Pp. 64. \$2.00.

*National Defense Language Development Program Research and Studies: Projects Initiated 1961.* OE-12014, Office of Education. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Pp. iv + 28. \$0.25.\*

PATTERSON, FRANKLIN. *Public Affairs and the High School: A Summer Pilot Program.* Medford, Mass.: The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, 1962. Pp. 44.

*Publications of the Office of Education, 1962.* Prepared by BERYL PARKE. OE-11000B, Bulletin 1962, No. 1, Office of Education. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. Pp. viii + 68. \$0.30.\*

RAFFERTY, MAX. *Suffer Little Children: Reflections on American Education.* New York 10: Devin-Adair Co., 1962. Pp. viii + 166. \$3.00.

\* For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.



# DIRECTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

	Term Expires January 15
Thomas W. Braden, President, Oceanside	1963
Raymond J. Daba, Vice President, Atherton	1966
Mrs. Talcott Bates, Carmel	1964
Nathaniel S. Colley, Sacramento	1964
Dorman L. Commons, Los Angeles	1966
Donald M. Hart, Bakersfield	1964
Bishop Gerald Kennedy, Los Angeles	1965
Mrs. Seymour Mathiesen, Fresno	1966
William A. Norris, Los Angeles	1963
Ben N. Scott, Harbor City	1965

**STAFF** (Unless otherwise indicated, all staff members may be reached at the State Education Building, 721 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento 14)

### SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Roy E. Simpson, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education

Jerry J. Keating, Special Assistant to the Director of Education

Laurence D. Kearney, Administrative Adviser

Mrs. Jane Hood, Assistant to the Superintendent, 807 State Building, Los Angeles 12

Roger C. Monroe, Personnel Officer

William E. Dresser, Field Representative

George E. Hogan, Deputy Superintendent; Chief, Division of Departmental Administration

Francis W. Doyle, Deputy Superintendent; Chief, Division of Special Schools and Services

Samuel W. Patterson, Assistant Division Chief

Richard M. Clowes, Associate Superintendent; Chief, Division of Instruction

Ronald W. Cox, Associate Superintendent; Chief, Division of Public School Administration

Ray H. Johnson, Assistant Division Chief

Wallace W. Hall, Associate Superintendent; Chief, Division of Higher Education

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, Bureau of, Marian B. Sloss, Chief

ADULT EDUCATION, Bureau of, Stanley E. Sworder, Chief

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, Bureau of, Byron J. McMahon, Chief

AUDIO-VISUAL AND SCHOOL LIBRARY EDUCATION, Bureau of, Harry J. Skelly, Chief

BLIND, FIELD REHABILITATION SERVICE FOR THE, Bernece McCrary, Supervising Teacher-Counselor

BUSINESS EDUCATION, Bureau of, R. C. Van Wagenen, Chief

CREDENTIALS OFFICE, Ethel Macpherson, Supervising Credentials Technician

EDUCATION RESEARCH, Bureau of, Henry W. Magnuson, Chief

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, Bureau of, Helen Heffernan, Chief

ELEMENTARY TEXTBOOK DISTRIBUTION, Burris E. Claypool, Supervisor

HEALTH EDUCATION, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, AND RECREATION, Bureau of, C. Carson Conrad, Chief

HOMEMAKING EDUCATION, Bureau of, Mrs. Dorothy M. Schnell, Chief

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION, Bureau of, Ernest G. Kramer, Chief

JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION, Bureau of, Emil O. Toews, Chief

LIBRARIES, Division of, Mrs. Carma R. Leigh, State Librarian, Library and Courts Building

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT ADMINISTRATION, Bureau of, J. Graham Sullivan, Chief

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES, Bureau of, Wm. H. McCreary, Chief

READJUSTMENT EDUCATION, Bureau of, Herbert E. Summers, Chief

SCHOOL APPORTIONMENTS AND REPORTS, Bureau of, Edwin H. Harper, Chief

SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION, Bureau of, Robert J. Clemo, Chief

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, James M. Hemphill, Supervisor

SCHOOL PLANNING, Bureau of, Charles D. Gibson, Chief

SECONDARY EDUCATION, Bureau of, Frank B. Lindsay, Chief

SPECIAL EDUCATION, Bureau of, Charles W. Watson, Chief

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATION SERVICES, Donald E. Kitch, Chief

SURPLUS PROPERTY, STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY FOR, William Farrell, Chief Surplus Property Officer

TEACHER EDUCATION, Carl A. Larson, Specialist

TEACHER RECRUITMENT, Blair E. Hurd, Co-ordinator

TEXTBOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS, Bureau of, Ivan R. Waterman, Chief

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, Wesley P. Smith, State Director

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICE, Andrew Marrin, Chief

**CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS**

Official publication issued monthly  
by the California State Depart-  
ment of Education, Sacramento 14,  
California.

Entered as second class matter at  
the Post Office at Sacramento,  
California.

●  
**RETURN REQUESTED**

